

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

PETE D. SALAZAR,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Civ. No. 19-517 KG/LF

PENNYMAC MORTGAGE
INVESTMENT TRUST HOLDINGS I,
LLC; PENNYMAC LOAN SERVICES, LLC;
PENNYMAC CORP.; WEINSTEIN & RILEY, P.S.,
AND DOES 1 THROUGH 50, INCLUSIVE,

Defendants.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

This matter comes before the Court *sua sponte*. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) provides in part:


If a defendant is not served within 90 days after the complaint is filed, the court-on motion or on its own after notice to the plaintiff-must dismiss the action without prejudice against that defendant or order that service be made within a specified time. But if the plaintiff shows good cause for the failure, the court must extend the time for service for an appropriate period.

Pro se Plaintiff filed this action on May 16, 2019, but Plaintiff has made no attempt to serve Defendants Does 1 through 50, inclusive. *See* (Doc. 1-2). To avoid dismissal without prejudice of this action against Defendants Does 1 through 50, inclusive, Plaintiff must, on or before September 12, 2019, either effect service on those Defendants or show good cause why he cannot effect service within that time.

Furthermore, to avoid dismissal without prejudice of this action against Defendants Does 1 through 50, inclusive, Plaintiff must, on or before September 12, 2019, show why the Court

should not dismiss the Complaint against Defendants Does 1 through 50, inclusive, for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6).

IT IS SO ORDERED.



UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE